

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As explained in Applicant's Amendment and Response to Office Action mailed August 5, 2004, the present claims recite that at least part of the electronic communication and the one-click translation component are displayed simultaneously. The one-click translation component of the present invention is visible before, during, and after the electronic communication is translated. This is sharply in contrast with Kato, which teaches that the translation component, or object identified as effecting a translation, does not exist until the text to be translated is selected by the user and does not exist after the text is translated.

Furthermore, the limitations of Kato would deter the skilled person from modifying Chong with the teachings of Kato. For example, many electronic communications comprise non-text objects such as graphics that interrupt the text to be translated and hinder use of the highlighting method taught by Kato. The text to be translated may be contained in different objects on the page, such as columns or text boxes, which would inhibit the use of the method taught by Kato. Where the text of the electronic communication to be translated was in multiple locations on the page, the method of Kato would require the user to highlight multiple areas. This would necessitate multiple clicks of the mouse button to translate the electronic communication, in contrast with the claimed invention, which requires only a single click. Furthermore, in Kato, the highlighted areas, i.e. the objects identified as effecting translation, would still not be clicked to effect the translation, in contrast with the claimed invention. In the present invention, the aforementioned problems encountered with Kato are addressed as described, for example, on page 4, lines 14-18. Nonetheless, the present invention is capable of translating an electronic communication in the form of sound, video, graphics etc., as specified on page 4, lines 26-29.

None of the prior art of record, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or renders obvious all of the features of the present invention as claimed. Therefore, Applicant submits that the skilled person would not have been motivated to modify the teachings of Chong by those of Kato to arrive at the method as claimed in independent claim 1, nor the system and apparatus of independent claims 17 and 26, respectively. Hence, independent claims

Appl. No. 09/676,690
Amdt. dated August 6, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 10, 2004

1, 17, and 26, and the claims dependent thereon would not have been obvious from the teachings of the cited prior art.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Evan R. Witt
Reg. No. 32,512
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: August 5, 2004

MADSON & METCALF
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700